

DEMODERNIZATION AS A HYBRID FORM OF MODERNIZATION OF TRADITIONALIST SOCIETY IN THE GLOBALIZED WORLD

Serhii S. Ordenov^{1*}, Hanna M. Kleshnia²

¹National Aviation University, Kiev, Ukraine, ²National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine, Kiev, Ukraine.

Email: ^{1*}sergeyordenov@rambler.ru, ²hannaaleshnia@yahoo.co

Article History: Received on 25th July 2019, Revised on 01st September 2019, Published on 10th October 2019

Abstract

The purpose of the article This article deals with the notion of demodernization as a form of hybrid modernization of a traditionalist society, which is being transformed into the system of global capitalism. The following thesis is substantiated that demodernization is a form of transformation that allows traditionalist societies to adapt to the economic requirements of the global world-system without carrying out structural changes in the social system.

Materials and methods: This research deals with the notion of demodernization as a form of hybrid modernization of a traditionalist society, which is being transformed into the system of global capitalism. This is a review of international interpretations. The article goes through works written by [Acemoglu & Robinson \(2016\)](#), [Ordenov \(2017\)](#), etc.

Results of the research: It is shown that demodernization mechanisms tend to be superimposed on the cultural period of our time, called Postmodern. Postmodern Culture cultivates the possibilities of demodernization in a global dimension since it is based on the perception of the world under the relativistic conditions of weakening values and integrity and dilution of the axiological and moral bases.

Applications: This research can be used for universities, teachers, and students.

Novelty/Originality: In this research, the model of Demodernization as a hybrid form of modernization of traditionalist society in the globalized world is presented in a comprehensive and complete manner.

Keywords: *demodernization, modernization, recursion, relativism, Postmodern, traditionalist societies, world-system, the model of global capitalism.*

INTRODUCTION

The current state of global society is characterized by the following factors such as accelerated socio-cultural dynamics, production of referential images of the world perception, as well as general intensification in the political, cultural, social and economic spheres. This state of the dynamic transformation of the global society in the form of the progressive evolution of various forms of industrial society is determined by the generic term modernization which claims to be a universal model of interdisciplinary coverage of development problems for nomological interpretation of most key events in the modernistic world. At the same time, the modernization processes of traditionalist societies are associated with the problems of destruction and regress in economic and social development. It is obvious that, while modernizing and acquiring modernistic features, traditionalist societies, in fact, remain a community. At the level of social relations, people there, as before, live in captivity of tribalism which indicates that the modernization processes acquire specific forms of demodernization there. Mechanisms of demodernization in traditionalist societies are not sufficiently researched in modern philosophical science, which confirms the relevance of our paper.

In a broad sense, modernization is understood as the process of transition from a traditionalist to a modernistic society of industrial-capitalist type. In the course of the modernization process, a qualitative update of the interconnected and interdependent social systems in society takes place, including its social structure and forms of interaction. The modernization process carrying a complex character includes:

- The formation of capitalistic social relations, based on industrialization and the private business dealing;
- The formation of a democratic liberal-legal form of government, based on a multi-party system and an electoral model of political behavior;
- The distribution of the range of social relations, based on the principles of accumulation and consumption of material goods along with the formation of an appropriate system of values and attitudes;
- The ubiquitous urbanization leading to significant changes in the distribution of productive forces and the socio-demographic structure of society, which has a significant impact on the population lifestyle;
- The domination of the economic form of social stratification, consisting in the uneven distribution of rights and privileges, responsibilities and duties, the presence or absence of social values, power and influence among members of a community;
- The creation of a highly differentiated institutionalized socio-cultural environment, based on the individualization of value orientations;

- The formation of a secularized social consciousness with a progressive type of thinking, the content of which is scientific knowledge, defined by the framework of rationalistic values, norms, and methods of obtaining it.

The process of modernization chronologically coincided with the several-hundred-old secular transition of Western society from the Middle Ages to the New and Modern Times, and was, in fact, generated by it. Modernization, as a whole, correlates with the modernistic period of historical development with the corresponding type of culture and public consciousness, value orientations and mental attitudes. The modernistic worldview, with such characteristics as rationality and faith in science, was based on the belief in the existence of objective things, laws of nature and society, reflecting the essence of these things that needed to be revealed and used for the purpose of qualitative transformation of the world and for the good of man. In the course of modernization, these rationally conditioned changes were translated into reality.

C. E. Black, the researcher of modernization processes, in his writing, *Dynamics of Modernisation* defined modernization as a process by which historically evolved institutions are adapted to the rapidly changing functions that reflect the unprecedented increase in man's knowledge permitting control over his environment, that accompanies the scientific revolution. This process of adaptation had its roots and initial influence in the Western Europe societies, but in the XIX-XX centuries these changes have spread to other societies and resulted in a worldwide transformation that affected all human relationships. S. N. Eisenstadt held a similar point of view arguing that historically, modernization is a process of change in the direction of three types of systems, such as social, economic and political ones, having been developed in Western Europe and North America from the 17th to the 19th century and then spread to other countries and continents. It can be concluded that the modernization process took place in certain space-time frames, namely, in the Western world countries of the modernistic period. It was then that the necessary conditions were achieved for its implementation in the form of an appropriate level of society development (entrepreneurial spirit and dynamism of capitalistic society) and social consciousness (rationalism and free-thinking).

Proceeding from the above, it can be argued that:

1. Modernization is a set of interrelated processes associated with industrialization, urbanization, secularization, intensive development of the educational and scientific sphere, the formation of representative political power, civil society, the expansion of political rights of participation, the rationalization of public relations, the intensification of spatial and social mobility, improvements in living standards.
2. The expanding individualization of relations, in the context of an autonomous and independent personality formation as a sovereign individual and the primary element of society, is an obligatory attribute of modernization. As for this, Ronald F. Inglehart and Christian Welzel rightly noted that the knowledge society enhances the role of personal independence, self-expression, and freedom of choice. Therefore, the affirmation of the values of self-expression transforms modernization into a process of human development, thus forming a humanistic society of a new type with a human in the center.
3. The liberal model is the ideological shell of modernization and, consequently, the capitalistic way of development is also, as it is based on the principles of private ownership, maximizing profit, initiative, rationality, and efficiency of using available resources that are key components of the modernization process.

Modernization theories represent the continuous differentiation and rationalization of all spheres of social life and relations as an essential feature of the modern world, positioning it as the universal objective trend of the historical process. Since Western society has gone far ahead in its movement from tradition to modernity, the countries lagging behind in the historical process are compelled to catch up with the Western world. This, in their opinion, is largely achieved at the cost of departing from traditions and reconsidering the established system of values. Apropos of this, V. Fedotova asserts that the model of modernization catching up with the West was recognized as the only possible for non-Western countries and was interpreted as a rejection of its own tradition in favor of new institutional ties borrowed in the West.

It should be noted that critics of modernization mostly blame it for Westernization that is thoughtless borrowing and transferring elements of Western life. In their opinion, that causes cultural trauma in non-modernistic societies, and therefore they call for developing alternative ways for them to modernize, which are based on the fact that, in essence, reject its main principles. For example, V. Gaitan believes that post-Soviet countries require alternative development scenarios and need the invention of palliatives of non-alternative, non-conflicting formation of an integrative space based on meta cultural, political, ecological, ethical, and aesthetic values (Gaitan, 2015). According to G. Malynetskyi, traditionalist Russian values and meanings can serve as an excellent basis for modernization: the spiritual is higher than the material; general is more than personal; justice is above the law; the future is more important than the present and the past. It should be noted that the criticism of modernization by traditionalist societies is mostly eclectic and based on certain algorisms.

METHODOLOGY

This research deals with the notion of demodernization as a form of hybrid modernization of a traditionalist society, which is being transformed into the system of global capitalism. This is a review of international interpretations. The article goes through works written by [Acemoglu & Robinson \(2016\)](#), [Ordenov \(2017\)](#), etc.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Modernization, in its essence, does not mean abandoning the tradition itself, but rejection of traditionalist way of life. It also assumes that the formation of new institutional bonds generally does not affect ethnocultural, spiritual or aesthetic values, since the institutions and values of spiritual culture belong to different spheres of life. In addition, collectivistic values and meanings cannot serve as a basis for modernization as they contradict the key individualistic principles of modernization.

Let us note that traditionalist societies, by their nature, have always resisted the changes that were produced by more liberal societies. As it is known, since the times of Sparta and Plato, their ideological doctrines were aimed at minimizing the role of the human brain and freedom in general history and social life. Realizing that a free and developed society corresponds to a certain social structure, they have always tried to down-grade the world outlook components of a free society. Primarily, it concerned realism in the worldview, reasonable practicality; therewith they tried to devalue the key achievement of liberalism which is the level of social relations. Creating the image of rational and, at the same time, mechanistic modernization and opposing natural originality of non-Western cultures to it, the adherents of traditionalistic sought to prove that sustainable development and social differentiation caused by it is not the only possible way to achieve progress. There are other ethnic or racial, cultural or national, natural or spiritual development alternatives.

Standing the processes of modernization against the cultural identity, national characteristics, local values, and traditions, traditionalist societies have always tried to avoid structural changes and at the same time to legitimize externally the archaic nature of the social relations they produce. Cultivating a local value system that distorts the essence and denies the axiological basis of modernization, these peoples sublimate the sense of inferiority into an especially inherent only to the system of morality, which is positioned as a kind of a spiritual, ethnocultural or national peculiarity. We believe that modernization, if it is relevant to traditions, first of all concerns rational thinking and egalitarianism that are the main enemies of tribalism and the associated dogmatism, archaism, and conservatism. Opponents of modernization, pushing ethnocentric arguments against it in the form of upholding the traditions and identity of cultures, which, in their opinion, will inevitably be demolished by the unrestrained flow of changes, are primarily afraid that historically developed social relations will be the subject of critical consideration and will be discarded as rudiments.

The above analysis of the essence of modernization suggests that in traditionalist societies neither spiritual values nor ethnocultural traditions themselves will come under its blow but primarily that would be social relations based on the primacy of the social over the individual, the unchanged over the volatile, the irrational over the rational, the totalitarian over the democratic, the order of limited access, as a common property of a social institution, over the open (North et al., 2009). Modernized society is alien to the traditionalist charms of manual control; in addition, the authorities there must be responsible both for their actions and inaction. These properties of the developed society make tribalism adherents be the leaders of the eternal rebellion against freedom and, accordingly, against modernization, as it threatens their domination based on slavish subordination and discrimination of the population.

Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson in their work *Why Nations Fail* noted that in poor countries the political elite is quite consciously going to block the very possibility of long-term economic progress because it believes that by doing so it realizes its own vital interests and needs. In the absence of the Institution of Civil Society in traditionalist societies, those controlling political power will eventually find it more beneficial to use their power to limit competition, to increase their share in the pie, or even to steal and loot from others rather than support economic progress ([Acemoglu & Robinson, 2016](#)). As a result, the system of social relations becomes focused on the concentration of all resources in the hands of elite representatives of social groups and on the appropriation of the labor results of the rest of the population. That is why the government there does not stimulate free economic activity, and also deliberately prevents the creation of conditions for the protection of private rights and freedoms.

At the same time, the slavish position of the population is not so much a consequence of the activities of the public authorities but is conditioned by the very form of the existence of such a society. It is quite obvious that all mechanisms of state, political and economic management will be directed to support the established way of life there. In one of the papers, we noted that in the traditionalist societies through laws the state reigns over citizens ([Ordenov, 2017](#); [Rincon-Flores et al., 2018](#)). Therefore, there, the principles of the Shang Yang legist school, unchanged throughout the millennia of history, are effective tools for establishing the institution of total lawlessness, which are manifested in such modern forms of tribalism as:

- Poor salary and meager social payments;
- Pressure on business and the prosecution of all kinds of independent economic activity by the authorities;
- As a consequence, the continuous dependence of the population on the state system of benefits and preferences distribution;
- Nepotism, bribery, and corruption as the key components are invariable and irreplaceable properties of the state apparatus;
- Manual justice and engagement of representatives of law enforcement agencies;

- The inequality erected in a system, based on the principles of clan belonging;
- The inaccessibility of social benefits, rights, and freedoms to the majority of the population;
- The introduction of propaganda as a unified form of communication in the state, the task of which is to spread the dominant ideas in the society infested with lies.

Consequently, if we throw off the ideological veil that is an unchanging companion of traditionalist societies, we will see the key elements of the community that make up the real foundation of their culture and traditions, protected from any encroachments and at any cost. And if we add to this that a certain type of sociality produces a certain type of social norms, or, according to A. Giddens's words, of intensive rules that appropriately determine the ways of social behavior, it becomes clear why modernization of a traditionalist society is a difficult, if at all possible ([Foster, J. B. \(2012\)](#)).

A. Giddens argues that the social actions of people... are not created by social actors, but are only constantly reproduced by them in the same ways by which people realize themselves as actors. Social workers reproduce the conditions that make this activity possible in the process and through their own activities. Given this statement, it can be said that the implementation of any constructs of the individualistic society in the social field of the communalistic system of relations will a priori be related to their interpretation predetermined by the structural features and produced by the traditionalist type of society. As a result, they will inevitably acquire hybrid forms, the framework of which will be determined by the sociocultural context of institutionalized practices adopted in society.

This hybridization process is significantly promoted by the peculiarity inherent in the communitarianism type of thinking, consisting of an artificial gap between reality, its interpretation, and consciousness, which has an entirely ideological basis. The specificity of the traditionalist ideology rests on the subject-object relations existing there, the essence of which lies in the dependence of a human, his subordination to external factors: culture, social environment, and relations, his own position in society, which, according to communitarianism doctrine, has a shaping influence on his consciousness. Hence, if consciousness is only the result of social influence, then it can be constructed in the course of radical social experiments artificially formed in isolation from the reality comprehended by reason. As M. Minakov rightly notes, a steady regime requires common articulated beliefs. Managing of beliefs becomes important for the stability of emerging non-free regimes ([Selomo & Govender, 2016](#)).

This is about purposeful activity related to the substitution of concepts and manipulations at the level of discursive consciousness that can cause difficulties in attributing the correct communicative modality of the received messages, as well as the messages with which he refers to others. This leads to distortion of consciousness, to various forms of its derealization in the form of distortion in perception including social reality. One can come to the conclusion that in traditionalist societies there is a systematic blurring of the semantic field of social facts that allows transforming them into an associative field. Due to this, the sign isolated from reality is unable to refer and denotes the sense, rather than meaning, representing not the world of reality but a pre-determined mental form obtained as a result of ideological processing.

It should be noted that the authorities in traditionalist societies have always skillfully exploited the features produced by the communitarianism type of sociality, consisting of the eclectic combination and reformatting of any individualist constructs into destructive relations and rational ideas into mental forms often leading them to absurdity. Due to this, the content of communitarianism consciousness is a rattling mixture consisting of alogisms and irrational thought-forms, which in fact enables us to call it a legal, socialist or democratic state which in reality preaches the slavish system of relations. Or, for example, it's as if in the case of unsettled private property relations (in the absence of individual rights and freedoms) we talk about economy management or capitalism building against all odds. In such a society, it also does not cause cognitive dissonance to assert that modernization can be carried out on the basis of traditionalist values that is, in fact, without being changed.

The mechanism of such modernization has always been based on a shallow change, directed not at the structural transformation of the traditionalist society but initially focused on the result. This is entirely consistent with the logic of the paternalistic management system, according to which all changes must be initiated from above going down vertically even if they are caused by the desire for liberalization. In this regard, any attempts to reform a traditionalist society lead to very unexpected results. Let us recall, for example, the reforms of Peter the Great who trying to civilize underdeveloped Russia introduced new orders by the iron hand. A. Hertsen described this process and its consequences, the overturn of Peter I replaced the obsolete, landlord governance of Russia with the European clerical order; everything that could be rewritten from the Swedish and German legislation, everything that could be transferred from municipal-free Holland to the communally autocratic country was fully adopted. But the unwritten and instinctual recognition of the rights of a person, the rights of thought or truth that morally curb the authority could not pass and did not. Slavery has increased with education; the state was growing and improving, but the person did not win; on the contrary, the stronger the state became the weaker the person was. The European forms of administration and court, military and civil structure have developed in some monstrous, desperate despotism there.

Modern technocrats have gone not far from Peter I preaching the same principle of reforming for traditionalist societies, namely, point or formal changes with an unchanged structure. Some of them suggest privatization so that the invisible hand of the market could direct the development in the right way. Others offer to introduce individualistic elements of

government (like decentralization) into the traditionalist system of relations that is feudal in fact. Still some others regard general computerization and technical re-equipment as a panacea. Proponents of such experiments say, for example, that if an industrial society is characterized by a conveyor model of production and a post-industrial one is marked by cluster production based on digital platforms, then by developing digital technologies we will achieve a breakthrough development and eventually get a post-industrial society (Lyashenko & Vishnevsky, 2018; Ajallooeian et al, 2015; Villalobos, 2018). Lenin was thinking likewise believing that the artificial industrialization would lead late-blooming Russia to a brighter future allowing at the very least two formations to pass. The pleiad of such social experiments is nicknamed like a catch-up or an exogenous modernization in world history. It only proves that primitive societies can be digitized, electrified and even industrialized if desired, but they will not cease being primitive and traditionalist. Current Ukraine is an example of it. Being reformed in such a way from the beginning of its formation, it remains in captivity of the oligarchic tribalism of clan relations (Minakov, M. (2016)).

Certainly, some supporters of the catch-up modernization see the precondition for the further development of the traditionalist society along the Western path in the institutional transformations with the subsequent perception of its values and forms of social life. But in practice, everything happens differently. The logic of modernization processes is built in such a way that, firstly, values in the form of healthy perfectionism, individualism and a rational type of thinking are being formed in the society that contributes to the development of an economic institution, which in turn leads to the maturing of private property interests in society. These processes must be culminated in structural reforms, particularly, in the formation of the Institution of civil society, entailing the establishment of the political system that represents different social interests as well as the construction of a rule-of-law state. The problem is that no matter how impartially we try to examine the modernization processes in its historical retrospect, only the visible, reflexed part of the historic path that Western countries have been able to pass through will be available to us. As for the reformers, they are in fact not interested in the endogenous factors at all that led the West to social transformations and brought us to the unsuccessful experience of reforms. Simon Kordonskyi in his work *Russia. The local federation argued reformers* (in Russia) do not consider it necessary to study domestic realities, replacing it with studying the advanced experience of developed countries (Shirvani et al, 2015). On the whole, we agree with this statement and can note that so-called reformers bother to study properly neither the domestic realities nor the advanced experience of developed countries since they really do not want to change something. This is what unites, for example, ardent leaders of revolutions and representatives of the oligarchy in the post-Soviet space. Neither those nor the other will be willing just to give unlimited power obtained in the result of political fraud. And if they carry out reforms, then under whatever liberal flags they pass, they will be directed to maintaining the existing order and strengthening their own domination. Thus, it can be argued that in the hands of traditionalists the modernization will most often take the form of the demodernization.

It gives rise to the following questions like: How does demodernization happen? Does it have a global manifestation (Wang, F. L. (2009))?

In our opinion, the demodernization mechanisms have the property to be superimposed on the cultural period of our time called Postmodern. Postmodern Culture cultivates the possibilities of demodernization in a global dimension since it is based on the perception of the world under the relativistic conditions of weakening values and integrity and dilution of the axiological and moral bases. Within the framework of postmodern culture, it becomes possible to acquire a form and obtain a result that bypasses the principles or even contrary to them. This is used to transform societies that are immanently oriented toward the permanency of their structure. At the same time, elements of individualistic society are used there such as institutions, social constructs, developments, technologies, which as agents of modernization are introduced into the social system of a traditionalist society. Thus, the individualistic concepts are superimposed on the communitarian structure that leads to hybridization of the former ones and the transformation of the latter ones. And everything that in the traditionalist society has not been hybridized is torn away at the level of public consciousness becoming imaginary social values and legal fictions. This is the fate of concepts generated in the individualistic environment such as legality, law, democracy, equality, freedom. For the traditionalist system of relations, all these are simulacra, which have no real meaning.

It should be noted that while modernizing in such a way, traditionalist societies actually achieve some definite goals. Firstly, they master more advanced technologies, social institutions, social constructs that allow them to use resources more efficiently and to achieve better results in modern conditions. Secondly, they do not need to change established relations and revise their system of values. Thirdly, the transformation of social institutions in the absence of structural changes causes a recursive effect in traditionalist societies which, while leading to regress in economic and social development, allows them to exist further without changing in essence.

It is entirely clear that demodernization will be supported by a certain part of the traditionalist society that represents hegemony and uses this situation for its own enrichment, that is, the oligarchy. What is the position of the West? Paul Collier notes, The West's current concern is terrorism, so we do something about it. The problem of governance in the bottom billion is not seen as ours, and so we do the minimum. Consequently, corrupt politicians at the bottom of the billion continue to stack their money away in Western banks. The problem of governance is an interesting issue produced by corrupt politicians in traditionalist societies. It is not a problem for the West. At the same time it is permissible the money stolen and withdrawn from the country due to corruption and demodernization is territorially located in the West.

This factor suggests that the Western economy benefits from the slavish position of the population in traditionalist societies and, consequently, the demodernization processes taking place there are profitable for them. Thanks to that the oligarchs will continue to stack their money away in Western banks. But besides that, Western countries have some more goals related to the demodernization of traditionalist societies ([Therborn, G. \(2003\)\).](#)

Firstly, when traditionalist societies introduce Western technologies and institutions, they thus form the markets and the structural subsystem of the global capitalism economy. Here, the feature of the Postmodern culture described by us is very useful. It is to achieve a form bypassing principle since the structural elements of the global capitalism economy are being penetrated bypassing such basic principles of capitalism as the rights of private property, liberalism, the rule of law, democracy, etc. In order for the banking system to work, the goods to be sold and money to be withdrawn to the Western offshore companies, these principles are unnecessary, moreover, they are dangerous and harmful. The rule of law in traditionalist societies is a dangerous and harmful phenomenon for the West, as it engenders competition, promotes investment and economic development, which ultimately leads to a redistribution of financial flows. The danger is hanging over the global economy as the sword of Damocles. It is the fear that in traditionalist societies people will start to defeat corruption. After all, only oligarchs have offshore accounts. And if there is no corruption and oligarchs, and the corruption generated and supported by them, how then will the money come from the economy of poor countries to rich economies ([Rabkin, Y., & Minakov](#))?

Secondly, the fact that traditionalists oppose structural changes is a fortune for the West. Do you want to live as before? You are welcome! Nobody was going to actually arrange capitalism for you. What is capitalism? Karl Marx asserted that capitalism is private ownership of the means of production. The key element in the formula of capitalism is a private property which means freedom, individualism, and the rule of law, democracy, and egalitarianism. Their derivative is development backed by social relations which means exponential development. Naturally, in their right mind, no one will come to raising their competitors and, therefore, creating conditions for their development. That is why Western countries are so little interested in the real situation with rights and freedoms in developing countries. Their attitude to this problem is known, The problem of governance in the bottom billion is not seen as ours, and only money is considered as theirs.

Thirdly, due to the fact that the transformation of social institutions in the absence of structural changes causes a recursive effect in traditionalist societies and hampers their further economic and social development, the processes of demodernization can reliably secure their seats in the system of global capitalism, the central one of which traditionally belongs to the countries of the West. At least until the global economic model has a capitalist form ([Kutuev, P., & Choliy, S. \(2018\)\).](#)

Immanuel Wallerstein mentioned a world-economy and a capitalist system go together. Since the world economies lack the unifying element of an overall political structure or a homogeneous culture, what holds them together is the efficacy of the division of labor. And this efficacy is a function of the constantly expanding wealth that a capitalist system provides. Obviously, the function of the labor division is constructed depending on the place in the global capitalistic system, which dictates the distribution of income. Thus, with the help of demodernization, the given limits of the world-system itself with its center (core), semi-periphery and periphery are formed, and the countries belonging to certain parts of the world-system are determined. These factors account for the lack of progress and the peripheral position of traditionalist societies in the world-system, their dependence and subordination in social, political and economic terms relative to other more developed countries([Minakov, M. \(2016\).\).](#)

CONCLUSIONS

The study showed that demodernization is a form of transformation that allows traditionalist societies to adapt to the economic demands of the global world-system without carrying out structural changes in the social system. Mechanisms of demodernization are an integral part of the Postmodern culture which cultivates the possibilities of demodernization in a global dimension since it is based on the perception of the world under the relativistic conditions of weakening values and integrity, eroding axiological and moral bases. The processes of demodernization allow traditionalist societies to develop more advanced technologies and institutions, yet they do not need to change established relationships and revise their system of values which determines their peripheral position in the system of global capitalism.

REFERENCES

1. Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J.A. (2016). *Why Nations Fail*. K.: Our Format.
2. Ajallooeian, E., Gorji, Y., & Niknejadi, F. (2015). Evaluate the Effectiveness of Social Skills Training through Group Therapy Play on Reducing Rational Aggression Boy Elementary School Student in Esfahan City. *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 1-4.
3. Barreto, D. M., & Alturas, B. (2018). Quality-in-use app evaluation: case of a recruitment app for Portuguese SMEs. *Quality-in-use app evaluation: case of a recruitment app for Portuguese SMEs*, (1).
4. Gaitan, V.V. (2015). *Modernization as a Factor of Transformation of Post-Soviet Countries*. The dissertation author's abstract in dissertation for the degree of candidate of political sciences, specialty 23.00.04 Political problems of international systems and global development, Odessa.

5. Lyashenko, V.I., & Vishnevsky, O.S. (2018). *Digital Modernization of the Ukrainian Economy as a Possibility of Breakthrough Development*, Kyiv: National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Institute of Industrial Economics.
6. Ordenov, S. (2017). Law as Good in the System of Social Relations: Social and Philosophical Study *Journal of the National Aviation University. Journal. Series: Philosophy. Cultural Studies*, 1 (25), 71-77. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2412-2157.25.12628>
7. Rincon-Flores, E. G., Gallardo, K., & Fuente, J. M. D. L. (2018). Strengthening an Educational Innovation Strategy: Processes to Improve Gamification in Calculus Course through Performance Assessment and Meta-evaluation. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iejme/2692>
8. Selomo, M. R., & Govender, K. K. (2016). Procurement and Supply Chain Management in Government Institutions: A Case Study of Select Departments in the Limpopo Province, South Africa.
9. rvani, M., Mohammadi, A., & Shirvani, F. (2015). Comparative study of cultural and social factors affecting urban and rural women's Burnout in Shahrekord Township. *UCT Journal of Management and Accounting Studies*, 3(1), 1-4.
10. Villalobos, J. V. (2018). Politics as a requirement. On the concept of Human Rights and the right to an autobiography as an ethical category. *Opción*, 34(85-2), 9-19.
11. Minakov, M. (2016). The De-Modernization Current: An Approach to Understand Ethical and Political Challenges of Post-Soviet Societies. *Global Political Theory and "Charitas in Veritate."* Lviv: UCU, 36-49.
12. Foster, J. B. (2012). The planetary rift and the new human exemptionalism: A political-economic critique of ecological modernization theory. *Organization & Environment*, 25(3), 211-237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026612459964>
13. Kutuev, P., & Choliy, S. (2018). Mobilization in post-socialist spaces: between imperatives of modernization and threats of demodernization. *Ideology and politics: Foundation for Good Politics*, (2), 10.
14. Minakov, M. (2016). The De-Modernization Current: an Approach to Understand Ethical and Political Challenges of Post-Soviet Societies:[book chapter].
15. Wang, F. L. (2009). Institutions, Modernity, and Modernization. *ProtoSociology*, 26, 100-118. <https://doi.org/10.5840/protosociology2009265>
16. Sobal, J. (2000). Social change and foodways. *Food Resource Nutrition and Food Management*, Oregon State University, Corvallis retrieved July, 10, 2009.
17. Minakov, M. Demodernization in Post-Soviet Eastern Europe.
18. Rabkin, Y., & Minakov, M. A Future in the Past.
19. Therborn, G. (2003). Entangled modernities. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 6(3), 293-305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310030063002>
20. York, R., Rosa, E. A., & Dietz, T. (2003). A rift in modernity? Assessing the anthropogenic sources of global climate change with the STIRPAT model. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 23(10), 31-51. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443330310790291>